



Office of Inspector General

## Administration Workpaper

Prepared by Brad Jones 01/27/2011

Assignment: 2010 - 1409 - OA-FY10-0253 - Region 7 Management of ASW Contract

Area: 538

Goal: Superfund

Type: PERFORMANCE/PROGRAM Subtype: Not Used

Assignment Period: 09/09/2010 through 09/09/2010

Section: C.02a

Assignment Guide Name: Reporting

Origination Doclink: 

Subject: R1 - Meeting to Discuss ASW Discussion Draft

Subsection:

	Initials	Date
Preparer	BJ	01/28/2011
PM	<b>MJP</b>	<b>2/4/11</b>
PLD		

Project Manager Edits/Additions in Blue Bold below. See Note 9 in A.01

◀Reference Verified by Project Manager

### PURPOSE:

To hold a meeting with Region 7 (b) (6) staff to discuss the *Hotline Allegations Unsubstantiated, but Region 7 Contract Administration and Award Issues Identified* discussion draft.

### SOURCE:

Auditor generated from the following sources:

1) Meeting with Region 7 (b) (6) staff. The meeting took place on January 27th at 11:00 AM in Room 5145 at the EPA Region 7 offices in Kansas City, KS (901 N. 5th St., Kansas City, KS 66101). The following individuals attended the meeting:

#### OIG Attendees

Mike Petscavage, OIG, Project Manager, 202-566-0897  
David Penman, OIG, Program Analyst, 913-551-7294  
Brad Jones, OIG, Auditor, 913-551-7840

#### Region 7 Attendees

(b) (6)



2) Document summarizing Region 7's issues with the Discussion Draft prepared by audit liaison.



Summary of Discussion Draft Issues.pdf

3) Discussion Draft with Region 7's comments provided by audit liaison.



Region 7 Comments on Disc Draft.pdf

#### SCOPE:

Held a meeting with Region 7 (b) (6) staff and let them know the basis for our report. The Region staff was given the opportunity to point out any areas where they felt there were factual inaccuracies and to respond to each recommendation.

#### CONCLUSION:

The Region 7 (b) (6) staff agreed with the recommendations laid out in the report, except for minor wording changes. However, they raised numerous issues in the body of the report. Overall, they felt the tone would give readers of the report the wrong impression. These are summarized in the table below along with the audit team's response and strategy for addressing the issue. The Region would like the OIG to issue a draft report so that they can provide formal written comments on the report. The staff present at the meeting stated that the Regional Administrator would like to have this done.

# Non-responsive

# Non-responsive

# Non-responsive

# Non-responsive

# Non-responsive

(b) (6) moved on and stated the next issue dealt with the annual invoice review. (b) (6) stated that the CO suspended costs on 12 of 33 invoices so invoices were reviewed. (b) (6) added that they just were not called an "annual invoice review". (b) (6) elaborated that (b) (6) would be contacted by the PO and alerted of questioned costs. (b) (6) added that (b) (6) ended up looking at the entire invoice. Petscavage asked (b) (6) identified any additional issues with those invoices (b) (6) responded that (b) (6) did not. Petscavage questioned the fact that (b) (6) only looked at invoices when the PO identified something and did not find any additional issues. The POs do not look into rates or similar situations. Additionally, Penman brought up the fact that the (b) (6) stated in (b) (6) interview that (b) (6) did not have time to perform an invoice review. (b) (6) said that (b) (6) just thinks it should be noted that (b) (6) did look at the 12 invoices and we should move on. Petscavage stated that we can add a sentence about the 12 invoices, but still the annual invoice review was not done. (b) (6) responded stated that if you do one review, the annual invoice review is redundant.

(b) (6) continued stating that (b) (6) has issues with the OIG stating that EPA does not have assurances just because the annual review was not done. (b) (6) stated they did have assurances (b) (6) added that as you go through the course of the contract you get assurances. (b) (6) said that the statement in the report is like killing a fly with a sledge hammer.

# Non-responsive

Status: Approved  
Current Editor List:

Level 1 approval:

Level 2 approval:      Approved

Send To:

Janet Kasper Granted Mass Approval

08/31/2011 01:32:52 PM

## Linkage Information

## History